

Concept of prAk-abhAva in advaita vedAnta

8th September 2024

Contents

S. No.	Topic	Page No.
1	Concepts discussed in the write-up	2
2	prAk-abhAva cannot be sAmAnyA-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-vishesha-abhAva	2-5
3	There is no pratIti of prAk-abhAva	5-6
4	The explanation by siddhAntI of the pratIti held by opponent as that of prAk-abhAva	6-9
5	Inadmissibility of sAmAnyA-abhAva in addition to yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa	9-11
6	vishesha-abhAva accepted by siddhAntI as adhikaraNa-swarUpa	12
7	abhAvAs cannot be distinguished on the basis of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka	12-14
8	How two abhAvAs are to be distinguished	14
9	prAk-abhAva is not required as ichchhA-vishaya	14-15
10	sAmyaika-atyanta-abhAva can fulfil the requirements of prAk-abhAva	15
11	prAk-abhAva is not needed to explain material causality	15-16
12	prAk-abhAva in Tattva-pradIpikA	16
13	prAk-abhAva in VedAnta ParibhAshA	16-17
14	prAk-abhAva in Tattva anusandhAnam	17
15	References	17

Concept of prAk-abhAva in advaita vedAnta

Concepts discussed in this write-up in a snapshot

This write-up is based primarily on the pratyaksha-pramANa-vichArah-in-ajnAna chapter of Advaita Siddhi. The basic concepts discussed are as under:

1. prAk-abhAva is not admitted in siddhAnta.
2. All requirements of prAk-abhAva can be explained by samaya-viseshha-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva.
3. prAk-abhAva cannot be sAMAnyA-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva.
4. There is no pratIti of prAk-abhAva.
5. tat-kAla-avachchhinna-yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa having a pratiyogitAkatva which is avachchhinna by sAMAnyA-dharma is the vishaya of pratIti 'इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति'.
6. It is impossible to admit a sAMAnyA-abhAva in addition to yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa.
7. It is acceptable in siddhAnta for abhAva to be adhikaraNa-swarUpa.
8. abhAvAs are not necessarily distinct if pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka are distinct.
9. While samaya-vishesha-anavachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva is contradictory to upAdAnatva, samaya-vishesha-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva is not contradictory to upAdAnatva.
10. Following NaiyAyikAs, at some places in siddhAnta, the usage of prAk-abhAva is made such as in avidyA-anumAna in VivaraNa. However, this does not imply that prAk-abhAva is accepted in siddhAnta.

prAk-abhAva cannot be sAMAnyA-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-vishesha-abhAva

Opponent: नन्वेवं-‘न जानामी’ति धियो ज्ञानाभावविषयत्वेऽपि न प्रतियोगिज्ञानादिना व्याहृतिः; सामान्यतो विषयप्रतियोगिज्ञानेऽपि विशेषतस्तदभावसंभवात् , अन्यथा प्रागभावधीर्न स्यात् । तत्प्रतियोगिविशेषस्य सामान्यधर्मं विना विशेषतो ज्ञातुमशक्यत्वादिति चेत् । Even if the cognition “I don’t know” has jnAna-abAhva as the vishaya, still there is no contradiction on account of pratiyogI-jnAna. There can be pratiyogI-jnAna sAMAnyatah whereas there can be abhAva of pratiyogI-jnAna visheshatah. That is to say - one can have jnAnatva-avachchhinna-tat-jnAna and at the same time abhAva of tat-jnAnatva-avachchhinna-tat-jnAna.

If we do not accept thus, there will be no cognition of prAk-abhAva.

This is because the pratiyogI of prAk-abhAva is tat-ghaTa which is not yet born. So, tat-ghaTa-tva is not born either. So, tat-ghaTa-tva-avachchhinna-tat-ghaTa-jnAna is impossible. However, gahTatva-avachchhinna-tat-ghaTa-jnAna can be there. So, it is evident in the case of prAk-abhAva that the pratiyogI, tat-ghaTa, is known sAMAnyA-dharma-avachchhinna i.e. ghaTa-tva but not vishesha-dharma-avachchhinna i.e. tat-ghaTa-tva.

Similarly, in the case of “mayi jnAnam nAsti”, there can be jnAna of pratiyogI tat-jnAna with jnAnatva as avachchhedaka but abhAva of pratiyogI-jnAna with tat-jnAna-tva as the avachchhedaka. And just as is the case of prAk-abhAva, there is no contradiction.

Answer: न । विशेषज्ञानाभावे हि विशेषज्ञानत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रतियोगीति तस्य ज्ञाने स विशेषोऽपि ज्ञात एवेति विशेषज्ञानाभावव्याघातात् । यत्किञ्चिद्विशेषाभावश्च न सामान्यावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताक इत्युक्तम् । प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकप्रकारकज्ञानाभावेन प्रागभावप्रतीतिरसिद्धैव ।

No. In case of vishesha-jnAna-abhAva, the pratiyogI is vishesha-jnAna and its pratiyogitA is avachchhinna by vishesha-jnAna-tva, because pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka is anyUna-anatirikta-vritti-dharma which is vishesha-jnAna-tva. Hence, if vishesha-jnAna-abhAva is known, vishesha-jnAna will be required to be known which in turn will imply that it is known not jnAnatva-avachchhinna but vishesha-jnAna-tva-avachchhinna. And hence, there is a contradiction with vishesha-jnAna-aAbhva because there is presence of vishesha-jnAna.

For e.g. ghaTa-jnAna is a vishesha-jnAna. ghaTa-jnAna-abhAva has ghaTa-jnAna as pratyogI with ghaTa-jnAna-tva as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka and not merely jnAna-tva as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. If ghaTa-jnAna-abhAva is known, then it requires ghaTa-jnAna, which has ghaTa-jnAna-tva as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, to be known. Thus, ghaTa-jnAna-abhAva is impossible.

It is a rule that vishesha-abhAva cannot be sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka.

Thus, in the case of prAk-abhAva, the pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka has to be tat-ghaTa-tva and not ghaTa-tva. Hence, in prAk-abhAva-jnAna, one has to admit pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna i.e. tat-ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-jnAna. This is impossible as tat-ghaTa-tva is not yet born. Hence, there cannot be cognition of prAk-abhAva.

Thus, since pratiyogitA(visheshaNatA)-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna is not present, visheshaTa-vaishishTya-avagAhI prAk-abhAva cannot be known either.

Opponent: ननु-प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकप्रकारकज्ञानं नाभावज्ञाने कारणम् , किंत्वभावज्ञाने भासमानप्रतियोगिवृत्तिधर्मप्रकारकं ज्ञानम् । सामान्यलक्षणाप्रत्यासत्त्यभ्युपगमे तु प्रतियोगिविषयत्वमपि तस्याधिकम् , इतरथा तु तदेव इष्टवृत्तिसामान्यधर्मप्रकारकज्ञानमिवासिद्धव्यक्तिविषयेच्छाकृत्योः ।

But pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna is not required for abhAva-jnAna. There can be abhAva-jnAna by the jnAna which has dharma-appearing-as-located-in-pratiyogI as prakAra and not necessarily pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-dharma only as prakAra.

In case sAmAnyā-lakshaNA-pratyAsatti is not admitted, then pratiyogI-jnAna is not the kArana for abhAva-jnAna, rather pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna is the kArana for abhAva-jnAna.

But that is impossible in case of prAk-abhAva-jnAna because pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna is tat-ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-jnAna which is impossible as tat-ghaTa-tva is unborn. So, ghaTa-tva, which is bhAsamAna-pratiyogi-vritti-dharma, can be a prakAra of jnAna and by that, there can be cognition of prAk-abhAva.

If sAmAnyā-lakshaNA-pratyAsatti is admitted, then by seeing any ghaTa, one can have knowledge of ghaTa-tva. And through sAmAnyā-lakshaNA-pratyAsatti, all Ashraya of ghaTa-tva i.e. yAvat-ghaTa become object of pratyaksha. Since tat-ghaTa is within yAvat-ghaTa, there is tat-ghaTa-jnAna also.

Thus, if one accepts sAmAnyā-lakshaNA-pratyAsatti, then one can have tat-ghaTa-visheshyaka-tat-ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-jnAna through pratyAsatti. And if one does not accept sAmAnyā-lakshaNA-pratyAsatti, one need not accept pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna. bhAsamAna-pratiyogi-vritti-dharma-prakAraka-jnAna is sufficient.

Thus, those who don't accept sAmAnyalakshaNApratyAsatti, for them, tat-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva-jnAna will not require tat-ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-tat-ghaTa-visheshyaka-jnAna. Rather ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-jnAna is enough to ensure tat-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva-jnAna. Now, ghaTa-tva-prakAraka-jnAna can happen by witnessing any ghaTa and not only the unborn tat-ghaTa. Therefore, it cannot be said that the pratIti of prAk-abhAva is untenable in either case.

Answer: But how can pratiyogitA of something be cognised through a dharma which is not pratiyogitA-avachchedaka? After all bhAsamAna-pratiyogi-vritti-dharma is not pratiyogitA-avachchedaka as it exists in several places and not merely in pratiyogI. It is not anyUna-anatirikta-dharma. So, a dharma which is not pratiyogitA-avachchedaka cannot result in cognition of pratiyogitA. This is so because pratiyogitA-avachchedaka-dharma is vyApya and pratiyogitA is vyApaka.

Opponent: Vishesha-abhAvIya-pratiyogitA can pretty well be avachchhinna by sAmAnyadharma. There is no problem. It is accepted that in case of tad-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva, the pratiyogI is tad-ghaTa, which is not yet born. However, there is no objection to the cognition of prAk-abhAva as the pratiyogitA is not avachchhinna by tad-ghaTa-tva (which is unborn) but by ghaTa-tva. If it were to be accepted that the pratiyogitA of tad-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva is avachchhinna by tad-ghaTa-tva, then it is true that there can be no perception of prAk-abhAva. Therefore, "iha idAnIm ghaTo nAsti" has kapAla-nishTha-tad-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva as vishaya with shuddha-ghaTa-tva being pratiyogitA-avachchedaka.

Similarly, "mayi jnAnam nAsti" has pramAtri-gata-tat-tad-pramA-prAk-abhAva as vishaya with shuddha-pramAtva as pratiyogitA-avachchedaka.

Thus, vishesha-abhAvIya-pratiyogitA can be avachchhinna by sAmAnyadharma and not necessarily by vishesha-dharma.

एवं च 'इहेदानीं घटो नास्ती'ति प्रतीतिरिव घटोपादानगततत्प्रागभावविषया 'मयि ज्ञानं नास्तीति प्रतीतिरपि प्रमातृगततत्प्रागभावविषयेति न काप्यनुपपत्तिरिति चेत् ।

Answer: न । अभावज्ञाने प्रतियोग्यंशे भासमानस्य धर्मस्यैव प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकतया यत्किंचिद्विशेषाभावस्य सामान्यावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्वे घटवत्यपि भूतले 'निर्घटं भूतलमि'ति घटज्ञानवत्यपि स्वस्मि'न्मयि घटज्ञानं नास्ती'ति च प्रतीतेरापत्तेः पूर्वोक्तदोषात् ।

No. Vishesha-abhAvIya-pratiyogitA cannot be avachchhinna by sAmAnyadharma. PratiyogitA-avachchedaka is defined as anyUna-anatirikta-vritti-dharma. If the pratiyogitA-avachchedaka of vishesha-abhAva were to be sAmAnyadharma, then there would arise the following absurdities:

- Even if there is a pot, say red-pot, on the ground, there would arise the cognition - there is no pot on the ground - घटवत्यपि भूतले 'निर्घटं भूतलम्' इति प्रतीतेः आपत्तिः. Because despite the red-pot being present on the ground, some blue-ghaTa-abhAva is there. And pratiyogitA of this vishesha-ghaTa-abhAva (blue-ghaTa-abhAva) being avachchhinna by ghaTa-tva and not by vishesha-ghaTa-tva (blue-ghaTa-tva), there would arise the cognition - there is no pot on the ground (even when there is presence of some other vishesha-ghaTa). That would be contradictory.
- Even if one has ghaTa-jnAna, still there would arise the cognition - I don't have ghaTa-jnAna - घटज्ञानवत्यपि स्वस्मि'न्मयि घटज्ञानं नास्ती'ति च प्रतीतेरापत्तेः. Even though I have ghaTa-jnAna (say red-ghaTa-jnAna), I will be having vishesha-ghaTa-jnAna-abhAva (say blue-ghaTa-jnAna-abhAva).

And its pratiyogitA being avachchhinna by ghaTa-jnAna-tva and not by vishesha-ghata-jnAna-tva, there would arise the cognition - I don't have ghaTa-jnAna. That would be contradictory because I already have red-ghaTa-jnAna.

Thus, pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka of vishesha-abhAva cannot be sAmAnyA-dharma but vishesha-dharma only.

Opponent: These absurdities will not arise. When there is red-pot-jnAna, then that red-pot-jnAna itself is the pratibandhaka in the cognition “निर्घटं भूतलम्”. Since there is yat-knchid-ghaTa-jnAna, that acts as a pratibandhaka in ghaTa-abhAva-jnAna.

Answer: यत्किञ्चिद्वटज्ञानं घटाभावज्ञाने प्रतिबन्धकमिति तु ज्ञानज्ञानेऽपि तुल्यम् ।

This is not so. You hold the vishaya of pratIti “mayi jnAnam nAsti” as jnAna-abhAva. However, since jnAna-abhAva-jnAna is admitted by you, there would be admission of pratiyogI-jnAna and anuyogI-jnAna. So, yat-knchid-jnAna is present. As per you, this should act as pratibandhaka of jnAna-abhAva-jnAna. Thus, your explanation of pratibandhaka contradicts your position.

There is no pratIti of prAk-abhAva

Opponent: But then there will arise the occasion of non-cognition of prAk-abhAva. Whereas it is accepted that “ghaTo bhAvishyati” has ghaTa-prAk-abhAva as the vishaya.

Answer: No. There is no cognition of prAk-abhAva. And the pratIti “ghaTo bhavishyati” does not have ghaTa-prAk-abhAva as vishaya. Rather it has “bhU-dhAtu-artha-bhavishyattA” as the vishaya. BhU-dhAtu stands for utpatti and hence “ghaTo bhavishyati” has bhavishyattvam as the vishaya. अथैवं प्रागभावप्रतीतिरेव न स्यात् , न स्यादेव; ‘घटो भविष्यतीति प्रतीतिः धात्वर्थभविष्यत्ताविषयत्वेन प्रागभावाविषयत्वात् ।

This is also on account of an absurdity - prAk-abhAva is located in this-day. Now, let us assume that the pratiyogI is to be born tomorrow or day after. However, since the pratiyogI is the pratiyogI of prAk-abhAva which is located in this-day, there should arise a cognition - अद्य घटो भविष्यति । This is absurd and hence rejected.

Opponent: But what is bhavishyattvam? It is defined as prAk-abhAva-adhikaraNa-kAlatvam. Without prAk-abhAva, bhavishyattvam itself is undefined.

Answer: Not so. pratiyogI-AdhAra-kAla is vartamAna. dhvamsa-AdhAra-kAla is ateeta. Therefore, bhavishyattvam is pratiyogI-tat-dhvamsa-anAdhAra-kAla-sambandhitvam. It does not require acceptance of prAk-abhAva. भविष्यत्वं च प्रतियोगितद्गुणानाधारकालसंबन्धित्वम् । [Presence of dhvamsa is associated with the cognition “ghaTah ateeta”, presence of pratiyogI is associated with the cognition “ghaTah asti”. Hence, AdhAra-kAla of dhvamsa is accepted as ateeta-kAla, and AdhAra-kAla of pratiyogI is accepted as vartamAna-kAla. Since the opponent thinks that prAk-abhAva is associated with the feeling “ghaTo bhavishyati”, he thinks that bhavishyat-kAla is the AdhAra of prAk-abhAva. That is refuted by siddhAntI by stating that bhavishyattvam can as well be explained as sambandhitvam-with-a-kAla-which-is-not-the-AdhAra-kAla-of-either-dhvamsa-or-pratiyogI].

Opponent: But what is dhvamsa? It is prAk-abhAva-pratiyogI-abhAvatvam only. So, the requirement of prAk-abhAva remains.

Answer: Not so. Those who do not accept prAk-abhAva, for them, dhvamsatvam is kAdAchitka-abhAvatvam. That abhAva which is not the vyApaka of kAlatva, that abhAva is kAdAchitka-abhAva and that is dhvamsa. BALabodhinI says -- योऽभावः कालत्वव्यापको न भवति, स एवाभावः कादाचित्क इत्यर्थः ।

Further, those who accept prAk-abhAva, even they don't accept that dhvamsatvam is prAk-abhAva-pratiyogI-abhAvatvam. They hold dhvamsa as pratiyogI-ajanaka-kAdAchitka-abhAva. prAk-abhAva is also kAdAchitka and pradhvamsa-abhAva is also kAdAchitka. However, prAk-abhAva is pratiyogI-janaka, whereas pradhvamsa-abhAva is pratiyogI-ajanaka.

Opponent: But what exactly is this janaka-tvam? कार्य-अव्यवहित-नियत-प्राक्काल-वृत्ति अनन्यथा-सिद्धमेव जनकम् । Further, kArya-prAk-kAla is nothing but kArya-prAk-abhAva-adhikarana-kAla. Now, pratiyogI-prAk-abhAva-adhikarana-kAla is pratiyogI-pUrva-kAla. Thus, janakatvam is contingent on prAk-abhAva.

Answer: But prAk-abhAva is defined on account of being pratiyogI-janka. So, if janakatvam is defined on the basis of prAk-abhAva and prAk-abhAva is defined on the basis of janakatvam, then it would lead to prAk-abhAva needing itself for its definition. So, for prAk-abhAva-jnAna, there will be a requirement of prAk-abhAva-jnAna. And hence, there will be AtmAshraya-dosha.

Therefore, even those who accept prAk-abhAva cannot accept janakatvam to be defined on the basis of prAk-abhAva.

Therefore, everyone should agree that janakatvam is some swarUpa-sambandha-vishesha. The meaning of swarUpa-sambandha-vishesha is that janakatva-dharma is janka-swarUpa-vishesha. It is not different from janaka-vastu. Advaita Siddhi says - । जनकत्वं च स्वरूपसंबन्धविशेषः, न प्रागभावघटितः प्रागभावस्याजनकत्वापत्तेः, अन्यथात्माश्रयात् ।

These discussions prove that even those, who accept prAk-abhAva, cannot claim pratyakshatva of prAk-abhAva. And those who do not accept prAk-abhAva (like siddhAntI), for them, it is a non-issue. अतः प्रागभावमङ्गीकुर्वतोऽपि तत्प्रत्यक्षत्वं दुर्लभम्, तमनङ्गीकुर्वतस्तु न कापि हानिः ।

PrAk-abhAva is not accepted in Advaita SiddhAnta. Wherever it is used to prove something, it is to be understood that it has been done accepting others' views for the time being. [BALabodhinI page 1157. Other references of prAk-abhAva-khanDana is also given]

The explanation by siddhAntI of the pratIti held by opponent as that of prAk-abhAva

Opponent: But then how do you explain the pratIti - इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति?

Answer: As demonstrated earlier, yat-kinchid-vishesha-abhAva cannot be sAmnAya-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka. BALabodhinI at page 1167-68 mentions certain basic features of prAk-abhAva as under:

- prAk-abhAva is not sAmAnyā-abhAva. It is mandatorily vishesha-abhAva.
- It can never be sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva.
- It (seems to) appear(s) in the samavāyi-pradesha (clay) of janya-bhAva (pot). It does not appear anywhere else.
- prAk-abhAva is that abhAva which produces the pratiyogI (प्रतियोगिजनक-अभाव एव प्रागभावः).
- prAk-abhAva produces some vishesha-ghaTa only. It never produces sAmAnyā-ghaTa.
- Therefore, prAk-abhAva is never sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva.
- The prAk-abhAvIya-pratiyogitA could be avachchhinna by vishesha-dharma inherent in vishesha-pratiyogI. However, since tat-ghaTa (vishesha-ghaTa) is not born, nor tat-ghaTa-tva is born, i.e. tat-ghaTa-tvena tat-ghaTa is not born, prAk-abhAva cannot be known.
 - Before pratiyogI-origin, tat-ghaTa-tva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-tat-ghaTa-abhAva cannot be known.
 - After pratiyogI-origin, prAk-abhAva itself is not there.

Since, prAk-abhAva is accepted as tat-ghaT-abhAva, it cannot be sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka. Now, “इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति” is sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-pratIti. Hence, it cannot be prAk-abhAva.

Therefore, the vishaya of this pratIti has to be samaya-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva. [यत्किञ्चिद्विशेषाभावः सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताको न भवितुमर्हति । अत इह कपाले घटो नास्तीति प्रतीतिरपि न प्रागभाव विषयिणी । किन्तु घटात्यन्ताभाव एवास्याः प्रतीतेर्विषयः . समय-विशेष-सम्बन्धी अत्यन्ताभाव एवोक्तप्रतीतेर्विषयः ।]- *BAlabodhinI* - page 1158

Opponent: What kind of atyanta-abhAva is it?

Answer: This pratIti has tat-kAla-avachchhinna-yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa as vishaya. Further, this tat-kAla-avachchhinna-yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa is sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka. ‘इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति’ति प्रतीतिस्तु सामान्यधर्मवच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकतत्कालावच्छिन्नावद्विशेषाभावविषया; समयविशेषस्याप्यभावावच्छेदकत्वात् । So, samaya-vishesha is an avachchhedaka of atyanta-abhAva (which is yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa) and this atyanta-abhAva is sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka.

The sAmAnyā-dharma involved here is ghaTa-tva.

Thus, in a nutshell, the vishaya of pratIti “इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति” is - ghaTatva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-tat-kAla-avachchhinna-yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa.

Opponent: What is the need of incorporating samaya-vishesha-avachchhinnatA?

Answer: Because otherwise, one would not have the pratIti - ‘आद्यक्षणे घटो नीरूप’ इति. It is accepted by VaisheshikAs that dravya situates without guNa for a moment at the time of its origin. Only after a moment of production, guNAs originate. The samavāyi-kArāNa of guNAs is dravya. Since kArāNa is prior in time, the samavāyi-kArāNa of guNa, must situate prior in time to guNa. If guNa were to originate simultaneously with dravya, then dravya cannot have samavāyi-kArāNatva of guNa. Therefore, VaisheshikAs accept that in the first moment, ghaTa is without rUPa.

So, the abhAva has to be avachchhinna by samaya-vishesha.

Now, this samaya-vishesha-avachchhinnatA cannot be with respect to rUpa-prAk-abhAva. It has to be with respect to rUpa-atyanta-abhAva.

For example, let us take a blue pot. It does not have red-rUpa. However, when heated, it turns red. So, prior to heating, it has red-rUpa-prAk-abhAva. Since, red-rUpa-prAk-abhAva is rUpa-prAk-abhAva as well, one can hold that blue-pot has rUpa-prAk-abhAva. Now, this would give rise to the usage “nIla-rUpa-vAn ghaTo nIrUpah”, which is absurd.

On the contrary, if one takes the samaya-vishesha-avachchhinnatA with respect to rUpa-atyanta-abhAva, then there is no absurdity as the vishaya of pratIti shall be “Adya-kshaNa-avachchhinno ghaTo rUpa-atyanta-abhAva-vAn”.

Thus, “इहेदानीं घटो नास्तीति” pratIti does not have prAk-abhAva as vishaya. Rather, it has सामान्यधर्मवच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकतत्कालावच्छिन्नयावद्विशेषाभाव as its vishaya which is atyanta-abhAva.

Opponent: But then it does not prove that there is a sAmAnyā-abhAva in addition to yAvAt-vishesha-abhAva?
अथ-अस्मिन्पक्षे सामान्याभावो न सिद्ध्येदिति चेत्!

Answer: True. But then that is the same in the case of prAk-abhAva also. sAmAnyā-abhAva and prAk-abhAva contradict each other like Sunda and Upasunda (two brothers mentioned in Vana-parva of MahAbhArata). If prAk-abhAva is accepted, sAmAnyā-abhAva is contradicted and vice versa.

How exactly?

If prAk-abhAva is accepted (for “iha idAnIm ghaTo nAsti”), then it *ipso facto* amounts to acceptance of avachchhinatA of vishesha-abhAvIya-pratiyogitA by samAnyā-dharma (ghaTatva). Why? Because prAk-abhAva is not sAmAnyā-abhAva but vishesha-abhAva (where pratiyogI is tat-ghaTa). Since neither tat-ghaTa is born nor tat-ghaTa-tva is born, the opponent accepts that pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka is ghaTa-tva. Thus, vishesha-abhAva, namely prAk-abhAva is ghaTatva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka. This would render it identical to sAmAnyā-abhAva. Because sAmAnyā-abhAva is distinguished from vishesha-abhAva only on account of sAmAnyā-dharma acting as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. If vishesha-abhAva were to have sAmAnyā-dharma as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, then vishesha-abhAva would not be different from sAmAnyā-abhAva. Thus acceptance of prAk-abhAva contradicts the acceptance of additional sAmAnyā-abhAva. [सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्न-प्रतियोगिताकत्वेनैव सामान्याभावो विशेषाभावेभ्यो भिद्यते। विशेषाभावोऽपि यदि सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्न-प्रतियोगिताकः स्यात्तर्हि सामान्याभावो न सिध्येत्, सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्न प्रतियोगिताकाभाव एव सामान्याभावः।]-
BAlabodhinI page 1159.

The only differentiator between sAmAnyā-abhAva and vishesha-abhAva is pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. If that is the same in both cases, then how can they be differentiated? So, if prAk-abhAva is accepted, that means if vishesha-abhAva is accepted to be sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka, then additional sAmAnyā-abhAva cannot be accepted.

Similarly, the vice versa also holds good.

Therefore, those who are learned, they are not concerned with either prAk-abhAva or sAmAnyā-abhAva. Just as prAk-abhAva is impossible to be accepted, similarly sAmAnyā-abhAva different from yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa is not possible to be accepted. [यथा प्रागभावो न सिध्यति, तथा यावद्विशेषाभावकूटव्यतिरिक्तः सामान्याभावोऽपि न सिध्यति ।] *BAlabodhinI* page 1160.

Inadmissibility of sAmAnyā-abhAva in addition to yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa

Opponent: Let it be so for prAk-abhAva. But there has to be a sAmAnyā-abhAva in addition to yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa. Because there is evidence to that effect. Even though one has the firm determination of yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva in vAyu, yet there are doubts relating to presence of rUpa-abhAva in vAyu in the form of “whether there is rUpa in vAyu”, “whether vAyu possesses rUpa”. This shows that there must be a rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva (which is vishaya of doubt) in addition to yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa (which is vishaya of knowledge).

Answer: There is no need to accept sAmAnyā-abhAva to explain this doubt. Only those who are not sure about the number of rUpas get this doubt. Those, who are certain about the number of rUpa, don't get this doubt. Someone can have a doubt that rUpatva is located in places other than prithivī, agni and jala. Such a person, despite having yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa-jnAna, may get this doubt. So, if कृत्स्न-रूप-अतिरिक्त-रूप-सम्भावना is present, the doubt is present. If कृत्स्न-रूप-अतिरिक्त-रूप-सम्भावना is absent, the doubt is absent. There is no need to accept some additional rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva for explaining the doubt.

Opponent: No. Even if कृत्स्न-रूप-अतिरिक्त-रूप-सम्भावना is absent, still the doubt “whether vAyu is rUpavAn” is seen to be present. Further, there is absence of pramANa in accepting the pratibandhaka “कृत्स्न-रूप-अतिरिक्त-रूप-सम्भावना-अभाव” (If this pratibandhaka is present, the doubt cannot arise). Therefore, one must accept sAmAnyā-abhAva other than yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa.

Answer: But there are two grades of doubt. One grade of doubt is about the presence of rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva, different from yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa, in vAyu. Another grade of doubt is about the presence of rUpa, different from yAvat-vishesha-rUpa.

You are ready to accept a rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva different from yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa, but are you ready to accept some rUpa-sAmAnyā other than yAvat-rUpa-vishesha? There is no such doubt possible because no such rUpa-sAmAnyā, which is other than rUpa-vishesha such as blue, red, yellow etc, is admissible by anyone including yourself.

Objection: Even though there is determination of yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa and hence one is convinced of rUpa-abhAva-in-vAyu as blue-rUpa-abhAva-tva, red-rUpa-abhAva-tva etc, one is not certain about rUpa-abhAva-in-vAyu as rUpa-abhAva-tva. Hence, sAmAnyā-abhAva needs to be accepted?

Answer: But that can be explained if yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa is accepted to be avachchhinna by rUpatva, which is a sAmAnyā-dharma. Thus, rUpatva-avachchhinna-pratibandhaka yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa is enough to explain the doubt of rUpa-abhAva-in-vAyu as rUpa-abhAva-tva. There is no need to imagine extra sAmAnyā-abhAva. [यदि सामान्य-अभाव-वादिभिः एवम् उच्येत - नीलपीताद्यभावत्वेन वायौ नीलपीताद्यभावनिश्चयेऽपि रूपाभावत्वेनानिश्चयात् रूपाभावसंशयः स्यादेव, तदा यावद्विशेषाभावातिरिक्तसामान्याभावकल्पनेनानलम् । रूपत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावत्वेन प्रदर्शितसंशयसम्भवात् ।]- *BAlabodhinI* page

1163. Advaita Siddhi says - यदि तु नीलपीताद्यभावत्वेन निश्चयेऽपि रूपाभावत्वेनानिश्चयाद्रूपासंशय इति ब्रूषे, तदा किं सामान्याभावेन; रूपत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावत्वेन संशयसंभवात् ।

We need to imagine only one entity i.e. sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva in abhAva. But you need to imagine not only sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva but also an additional sAmAnyā-abhAva. Thus, while you have to imagine two entities, dharma and dharmI, we need to imagine only one entity and that is dharma. So, our view is correct.

Further, this sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva resides in yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa and not in individual vishesha-abhAva. This residence is through vyAsajya-vritti, just as dvitva (two-ness), tritva (three-ness) etc reside in the two entities, three entities etc as a whole and not in individual constituents. [यावद्विशेषाभावकूटे सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्वस्य व्यासज्यवृत्तितया कल्पनात् न प्रत्येकविशेषाभावे सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्वं वर्तते ।] *BALabodhinI* page 1163.

Thus, in case of pratIti - ‘आद्यक्षणे घटो नीरूप’ - the rUpatva-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva is located in yAvat-rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa through vyAsajya-vritti. It is not located in some individual rUpa-vishesha-abhAva. This would not be the case when there is a blue-pot having red-rUpa-abhAva, and which gets red-rUpa on heating. In this case, there cannot be vyAsajya-vritti and hence, there cannot be an occasion of pratIti “ghato nIrUpah”.

Opponent: Your claim of lAghava is not correct. Actually, lAghava is in our case, where additional sAmAnyā-abhAva is admitted. Both of us agree on the requirement of a dharma namely sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva. However, we need an additional sAmAnyā-abhAva in which this sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva will be located. So, we need two entities. You, on the contrary, require this sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAkātva and also sambandha in each of the vishesha-abhAva through vyAsajya-vritti. [विशेषाभावपक्षे विशेषाभावकूटे सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्वं तस्य च व्यासज्यवृत्तित्वेन बहुषु विशेषाभावेषु प्रत्येकं सम्बन्धं कल्पनीयाः इति बहु कल्प्यम् ।] So, it is your case where there is more imagination.

Answer: Not really. In our case, there is a requirement of only two entities, whereas in your case, three entities are to be imagined. Whether or not sAmAnyā-abhAva is accepted, both of us have to agree on the requirement of yAvat-vishesha-abhAva, because that is pratIti-siddha (page 1175. *BALabodhinI*). It is also accepted by both of us that these yAvat-vishesha-abhAva have sambandha with tat-tat-adhikaraNa (infinite kArya-vAyu in which yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa is located) with eka-vritti-tva as avachchhedaka. These two are already कृप्त (accepted). [कृप्ततत्तदधिकरणसंबन्धानामेकाधिकरणवृत्तित्वावच्छेदेन सिद्धानाम्]- Advaita Siddhi.

Now, in your case, the following three entities are required:

- sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratīyogitAka-tvam (dharma)
- sAmAnyā-abhAva (dharmI)
- The sambandha of sAmAnyā-abhAva with tat-tat-adhikaraNa [There are several vAyu which can function as adhikaraNa. rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva will need to have sambandha with such infinite adhikaraNa.] - page 70, Volume 3, *Advaita Siddhi, DakshiNAMurti MaTh*

We, on the other hand, require the following:

- sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-tvam (dharma)
- vyAsajya-vritti-tva-rUpa-dharma of sAmAnyā-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-tvam (through which the latter dharma is located in numerous vishesha-abhAva).

Thus, it is the case of yAvat-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa-vAdI, which has lAghava.

Opponent: In case of pratyaksha of vyAsajya-vritti-dharma such as dvitva, tritva etc, there is a requirement of pratyaksha of all Ashraya (yAvat-Ashraya-pratyaksha), and also pratyaksha of mutual bheda of yAvat-Ashraya with each other. If these two conditions are not satisfied, vyAsajya-vritti-pratyaksha cannot happen. For e.g. if dvitva is to be seen in two clothes, there is requirement of pratyaksha of both clothes as well as pratyaksha of their mutual distinction. Otherwise pratyaksha of dvitva cannot be done. If सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्व dharma is accepted as vyAsajya-vritti, the mutual distinction of all vishesha-abhAva needs to be perceived for the perception of vyAsajya-vritti. That is impossible (whether or not there is perception of all Ashraya i.e. vishesha-abhAva, there is impossibility of perception of their mutual distinction - तथा च यावद्व्यपविशेषाभावाग्रहे ग्रहेऽपि वा तद्वेदाग्रहे नीरूप इति बुद्धिर्न स्यात् *BAla Bodhini page 1166*). Hence, your claim of सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्व as vyAsajya-vritti is not acceptable.

Answer: No. Even though there is a requirement of yAvat-Ashraya-pratyaksha and also Ashraya-bheda-pratyaksha in case of vyAsajya-vritti-dharma such as dvitva, tritva etc, there is no such requirement in the case of सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्व. This is because of the principle - कार्योन्नेयधर्माणां यथाकार्यमुन्नयनात्, meaning thereby that kAraNa is imagined in accordance with kArya.

कार्य = the pratIti ‘आद्यक्षणे घटो नीरूपः’

उन्नेय-धर्म = kalpanIya-dharma = रूपत्वसामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्व

यथा = non-requirement of yAvat-Ashraya-pratyaksha and yAvat-Ashraya-bheda-pratyaksha

Thus, it is held on account of pratIti that रूपत्वसामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकत्व is located as vyAsajya-vritti without the requirement of yAvat-Ashraya-pratyaksha and yAvat-Ashraya-bheda-pratyaksha (unlike that of dvitva, tritva etc).

Opponent: How exactly does this pratIti ‘आद्यक्षणे घटो नीरूपः’ establishes the above?

Answer: This pratIti is accepted by everyone because in the first-moment, dravya does not have any guNa. Hence, initial-kshaNa-avachchhinna-dravya is without rUpa. This is admitted by everyone.

Now, we have already established above that this pratIti cannot have rUpa-sAmAnyā-abhAva as vishaya. Further, many rUpAs are going to be born in the clay through pot, hence rUpa-sAmAnyā-atyanta-abhAva cannot be accepted either as atyanta-abhAva is traikAlīka. Therefore, rUpa-vishesha-abhAva-kUTa with rUpatva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAkātva dharma is proved to be the vishaya of pratIti wherein the dharma is located through vyAsajya-vritti without the requirement of yAvat-Ashraya-pratyaksha or yAvat-Ashraya-bheda-pratyaksha. [*BAlabodhini Page 1177*]

vishesha-abhAva accepted by siddhAntI as adhikaraNa-swarUpa

Opponent: You are not ready to accept additional sAmAnyA-abhAva on account of lAghava. Then, why are you not going for extreme lAghava? Why are you accepting so many vishesha-abhAva? Because if you accept so many vishesha-abhAva, you need to accept their adhikaraNAs as well. Therefore, let those adhikaraNAs, which are admitted by both parties, be themselves the vishesha-abhAva-dhI-hetu. What is the need for accepting so many vishesha-abhAva. [There are several kArya-vAyu. Each is a valid adhikaraNa. Each of these has several rUpa-vishesha-abhAva.]

Answer: Well, this is acceptable to us. It is an IshTa-Apatti.

Opponent: But adhikaraNa of vishesha-abhAva is bhava-vastu. How can it be the vishaya of abhAva-pratIti? There is a vailakshaNya in bhAva and abhAva.

Answer: There is no such rule that bhAva-vastu cannot be the vishaya of abhAva-pratIti. ghaTa-abhAva-abhAva is bhAva-vastu and yet it is a vishaya of abhAva-pratIti. Therefore, both of us agree that bhAva-adhikaraNa can be vishaya of abhAvatva-prakAraka-pramA-pratIti. Therefore, we accept this extreme lAghava by not accepting abhAva at all. [अतो भावोऽपि अभावत्वप्रकारकप्रमाप्रतीतेर्विषयो भवतीति उभयवादिसिद्धम्। अतो अभावाधिकरणमपि भाववस्तु अभावत्वप्रकारकप्रमाप्रतीतेर्विषयो भवितुमर्हतीति अभावमात्रानङ्गीकारे अतिलाघवमेव।] *BAlabodhinI* page 1178.

abhAvAs cannot be distinguished on the basis of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka

Opponent: The controlling factor in abhAva-bheda is abhAvIya-pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-bheda. If there is no distinction in pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, there is no distinction in abhAva either. Therefore, one must admit a sAmAnyA-abhAva distinct from vishesha-abhAva, because both have distinct pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka (sAmAnyA-dharma and vishesha-dharma respectively). That is why even if pratiyogI is same, say ghaTa, yet, on account of difference in pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, there can be different abhAvAs such as prAk-abhAva, pradhvamsa-abhAva, anyonya-abhAva, atyanta-abhAva having their pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka as under:

S. No.	abhAva	pratiyogI	pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka
1	tat-ghaTa-prAk-abhAva	tat-ghaTa	pUrva-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva
2	tat-ghaTa-pradhvamsa-abhAva	tat-ghaTa	apara-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva
3	tat-ghaTa-anyonya-abhAva	tat-ghaTa	tAdAtmya
4	tat-ghaTa-atyanta-abhAva	tat-ghaTa	sansarga

Thus, on account of the difference in pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka of sAmAnyA-abhAva and vishesha-abhAva, one must admit sAmAnyA-abhAva in addition to vishesha-abhAva. [*BAlabodhinI* page 1179]

Answer: This cannot be admitted. Because among sansarga and the other three pratiyogi-visheshaNa namely, pUrva-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva, apara-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva and tAdAtmya, there is no common dharma which is eligible to be called as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. Further, there is absence of pramANa for accepting tAdAtmya, sansarga, pUrva-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva and apara-kAlIna-tat-ghaTatva as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. [संसर्गप्रतियोगिविशेषणसाधारणस्यैकस्यावच्छेदकत्वस्य दुर्वचत्वात्, तादात्म्यादेश्च प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकत्वे मानाभावात्।] *Advaita Siddhi page 1179 (BALabodhinI)*

If the pratiyogi-visheshaNa is nyUna-vritti or adhika-vritti as compared to pratiyogI, then it cannot be pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka dharma. For example, in the cognition “घटो भूतले समवायेन नास्ति”, samavAya is not sama-niyata to pratiyogitA, because samavAya is accepted as one and is present in pot etc also. [A and B are sama-niyata, if A is vyApya as well as vyApaka of B and vice versa. The abhAva of sama-nivayata vastu are identical. There is no bheda in them समनियतयोः अभावयोः ऐक्यम्.]

Therefore, samsarga and the other three dharma cannot have one pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-tva. Hence, they cannot be accepted as pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. Therefore, your claim is not correct.

Further, in the cognition - “भूतले संयोगेन घटो नास्ति” - there is difference in pratiyogitA-avachchedaka-dharma (ghaTatva) and samsarga (samyoga). And yet, the abhAva is not distinct. Hence, one cannot have this vyApti that wherever there is distinction of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, there is distinction of abhAva [यत्र यत्र प्रतियोगितावाच्छेदकभेदः, तत्र तत्र अभावभेदः - this vyApti has vyabhichAra-dosha].

Similarly, two sama-niyata padArtha have identical abhAva even when their pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka are different, such as gandha-prithivI-tva.

Further, in instances like AkAsha and dishA, which are avritti-dravya, that is, they are not located anywhere (गगनादिद्रव्याणि कुत्रापि न वर्तन्ते, अतस्तेषामभावः सर्वत्र वर्तते; अतो गगनादीनामभावा न भिद्यन्ते।), there is no difference in their atyanta-abhAva, even when pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-dharma would be different.

Further, if you accept vyadhikaraNa-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitA-abhAva, then ghaTa is not present on bhUtala paTatvena, through both samyoga as well as samavAya sambandha. So, the pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka-sambandha are different, namely samyoga and samavAya. And yet, the vyadhikaraNa-abhAva, namely paTatvena ghaTa-abhAva, is identical. [Page 75, volume 3, *Advaita Siddhi, DakshiNAmUrti MaTh*]

Thus, the difference in abhAva cannot be stated on account of the difference of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka.

Opponent: Let atyanta-abhAva be not distinguished on account of difference of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka. But prAk-abhAva and pradhvamsa-abhAva can be distinguished on the basis of difference of pratiyogitA-avachchhedak.

Answer: Not so. Because prAk-abhAvAs of those vastu, which are born in the same place and at the same time, for example rUpa, rasa etc belonging to the same ghaTa, are accepted to be the same. Similarly, if they are destroyed together, their pradhvamsa-abhAva is also accepted to be the same, if there is no bAdhaka. Thus, your rule of difference of abhAva on account of difference of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka is inapplicable in case

of prAk-abhAva and pradhvamsa-abhAva as well. युगपद्विनष्टानामुत्पन्नानां वा समानदेशानामसति बाधके एक एव ध्वंसः प्रागभावो.

How two abhAvAs are to be distinguished

Objection: Then how are two abhAvAs to be distinguished, if not on the basis of pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka?

Answer: Just as two bhAvAs are distinguished on the basis of viruddha-dharma-adhyAsa such as coldness and warmth, similarly through viruddha-dharma-adhyAsa, two abhAvAs can be distinguished. भेदसिद्धिस्तु भाववदभावस्यापि विरुद्धधर्माध्यासादेव ।

Here, Tattva anusandhAna says - *If abhAva is accepted to be different on account of difference in pratiyogitA-avachchhedaka, then there will arise the contingency of accepting infinite abhAva. This is so because there are infinite such avachchhedaka of pratiyogitA such as prameya-tva, prithivI-tva, dravya-tva etc. When we have the anubhava - ghaTa is not here - we equally have the anubhava - dravya-ghaTa is not here, prameya-ghaTa is not here, prativI-ghaTa is not here etc. However, this is not accepted.*

Thus, it is reiterated that the cognition “न जानामि” has bhAvarUpa-ajnAna as its vishaya. MADhva and Vaisheshika hold this cognition to have jnAna-vishesha-abhAva as the vishaya. It has been proved that jnAna-vishesha-abhAva cannot be shuddha-jnAnatva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva. We have also demonstrated that jnAna-vishesha-prAk-abhAva cannot be jnAtatva-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka-abhAva because those who hold the pratIti to be abhAva have to accept the pratIti to be sAmanya-dharma-avachchhinna-pratiyogitAka which prAk-abhAva can never be. Hence, the cognition “न जानामि” cannot have either jnAna-vishesha-atyanta-abhAva or jnAna-vishesha-prAk-abhAva as its vishaya. Therefore, the pratIti “न जानामि” has to have bhAvarUpa-ajnAna as its vishaya. [BAla BodhinI page 1167]

prAk-abhAva is not required as ichchhA-vishaya

Opponent: prAk-abhAva must be accepted. Everyone has a desire “this anishTa should not happen to me”. Thus, the vishaya of ichchhA is anishTa-prak-abhAva. Propelled by this desire, one engages in nitya karma etc. If one does not accept prAk-abhAva, then anishTa-prAk-abhAva being ichchhA-vishaya of everyone stands rejected. Hence, prAk-abhAva must be accepted.

Answer: Let us accept your claim by tushyatu-durjana-nyAya for the time being. Still, you must agree that the vishaya of ichchhA is not anishTa-prAk-abhAva but the samandha-of-anishTa-prAk-abhAva with the person. prak-abhAva is anAdi and hence not a sAdhya. Hence, ichchhA-vishaya cannot be prAk-abhAva on account of not being a sAdhya. He wishes that this sambandha should continue. Hence, he proceeds to destroy the janaka of anishTa, the pratiyogI of this anishTa-prAk-abhAva. The janaka of pratiyogI is not performing nitya-karma. So, he proceeds to ensure the continuance of sambandha-of-anishTa-prAk-abhAva through pratiyogI-janaka-vighaTana i.e. by destroying the janaka of anishTa i.e. by performing nitya karma.

Now, this being so, the same can be explained through atyanta-abhAva-sambandha. There is no need to accept prAk-abhAva because both of us accept atyanta-abhAva.

atyanta-abhAva is nitya, hence it is not sAdhya either. However, atyanta-abhAva-sambandha can be sAdhya. The ichchhA-vishaya is atyanta-abhAva-sambandha. In order to not have the sambandha of the person with pratiyogI-of-atyanta-abhAva (anishTa) in kAlAntara, one can proceed with pratiyogI-janaka-vighaTana (performance of nitya karma). ननु 'इदं मा भूदिति'च्छाविषयतया तत्सिद्धिः, न; प्रागभावस्य स्वरूपतोऽसाध्यत्वेन प्रतियोगिजनकविघटनेन तत्संबन्धस्येवात्यन्ताभावसंबन्धस्यापि साध्यत्वात्तेनैवान्यथासिद्धेः ।

Hence, there is no need of accepting prAk-abhAva. (Vol. 3, page 66, Advaita Siddhi, DakshiNAmUrti MaTh)

sAmyaika-atyanta-abhAva can fulfil the requirements of prAk-abhAva

Opponent: उत्पन्नस्य द्वितीयक्षणे पुनरुत्पत्त्यभावात्तत्पूर्वक्षणे सामग्र्यभावो वाच्यः; स च प्रागभावाभावादेव, अन्यहेतूनां सत्त्वादिति चेत्. Still one needs to explain as to why the kArya is not produced again in second moment, even when kArya has been produced. All the sAmagrI which was present before kArya-utpatti, those are present even in kArya-utpatti-kshaNa and yet kArya is not produced again. Thus, one needs to accept a prAk-abhAva which was earlier present and is no longer present so as to explain non-re-production of kArya. कार्योत्पत्तेः प्राक् कार्यस्य प्रागभाव आसीत् 'कार्योत्पत्तिकाले स प्रागभावो नष्ट इत्येव सामग्रीभेदात् उत्पन्नस्य न पुनरुत्पादापत्तिः। If one does not accept a prAk-abhAva thus, one will not be able to explain the non-re-production of kArya on account of presence of identical sAmagrI.

Answer: Not so. Because it can be explained by sAmayika-atyanta-abhAva. There is no need to accept a prAk-abhAva for that. atyanta-abhAva is anAdi. Just as its avachchhinnatA by desha-vishesha is anubhava-siddha, similarly kAla-vishesha is also its avachchhedaka. Thus, sAmayika-atyanta-abhAva, i.e. kAla-vishesha-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva is enough to explain prAk-abhAva. That is to say - pUrva-kshaNa-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva can be accepted to be present before, but absent later resulting into non-re-production. अनाद्यत्यन्ताभावस्य देशविशेषवत् कालविशेषोऽपि अवच्छेदकः ; देशविशेषे अत्यन्ताभावो यथा अनुभवसिद्धः तथा कालविशेषोऽपि । अतः कालविशेषे अधिकरणसंसर्गिणा अत्यन्ताभावेनैव प्रागभावस्वीकारफलं सेत्स्यति । अतः प्रागभावाङ्गीकारो मुधा; अतः अयम् अत्यन्ताभावः सामयिकात्यन्ताभाव उच्यते ।

prAk-abhAva is not needed to explain material causality

Opponent: prAk-abhAva still needs to be accepted in order to explain material causality. For e.g. there is paTa-prAk-abhAva in tantu, hence tantu is the material cause of paTa. Similarly, ghata-prAk-abhAva is located in kapAla and hence kapAla is the material cause of ghaTa. If prAk-abhAva is not admitted, then material causality cannot be explained.

Answer: Not so. Because it needs to be explained as to why paTa-prAk-abhAva is situated only in tantu and not in kapAla. If one answers that it is because of tantu-tva that paTa-prAk-abhAva is situated in tantu, then tantu-tva can be accepted as the factor controlling the material causality. There is no need to accept paTa-prAk-abhAva. So, tantu is material cause of paTa on account of tantu-tva, kapAla is material cause of ghaTa on account of kapAla-tva.

Opponent: Prior to production of kArya, there must be abhAva of kArya in upAdAna. Since you accept only atyanta-abhAva, there must be atyanta-abhAva of kArya in upAdAna. Then, how can that be the upAdAna if it has atyanta-abhAva of kArya? Hence, prAk-abhAva must be accepted.

Answer: Not so. Even though there is atyanta-abhAva of kArya in upAdAna prior to kArya-utpatti, there is no atyanta-abhAva of kArya in upAdAna subsequent to kArya-utpatti. So, ghaTa-atyanta-abhAva in kapAla is samaya-vishesha-avachchhinna, however, the paTa-atyanta-abhAva in kapAla is samaya-vishesha-anavachchhinna.

Thus, it is only samaya-vishesha-anavachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva which is contradictory to upAdAna-tva. Samaya-vishesha-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva is not contradictory to upAdAna-tva. अत्यन्ताभावस्य समयविशेषावच्छिन्नत्वानवच्छिन्नत्वाभ्यां वैलक्षण्यात् समयविशेषानवच्छिन्नात्यन्ताभाव उपादानत्वविरोधी, समयविशेषावच्छिन्नात्यन्ताभावस्तु नोपादानत्वविरोधी ।

Thus, we see that prAk-abhAva is not at all accepted in siddhAnta and samaya-vishesha-avachchhinna-atyanta-abhAva is enough to explain prAk-abhAva.

prAk-abhAva in Tattva-pradIpikA

Tattva-pradIpikA, in accordance with KhanDana-khanDa-khAdya, rejects not only prAk-abhAva but also abhAva. While rejecting prAk-abhAva, it proves that prAk-abhAva cannot be defined faultlessly. If one defines prAk-abhAva as vinAshI-abhAva with a view to distinguish it from other three abhAvAs which are all endless, the text asks as to what exactly does vinAshI stand for:

1. Does it stand for utpattimat-abhAva-vat-tvam, like in the case of pot as evident from cognition “ghaTo vinshTah”? Or,
2. Does it stand for abhAva-vat-tvam?

In case of 1, since prAk-abhAva-nivritti is nothing but pratiyogI, there is asambhava of the lakshaNa because its nivritti is not abhAva but bhAva.

If prAk-abhAva-nivritti is other than pratiyogI, then there is ativyApti in pradhvamsa-abhAva etc as they are also proved in siddhAnta to be vinAshI.

In case of 2, there is clear ativyApti in the case of pradhvamsa-abhAva.

Thus, Tattva-pradIpikA does not accept prAk-abhAva. However, it does not stop there but rejects abhAva. However, it accepts that abhAva can be adhikaraNa.

<https://archive.org/details/chitsukhiyogindrananda/page/n483/mode/2up?view=theater>

prAk-abhAva in VedAnta ParibhAshA

However, following NyAya, VedAnta ParibhAshA does accept the four-fold division of abhAva. As per NyAya, prAk-abhAva is defined as अनादिः सान्तः प्रागभावः. This prAk-abhAva is located in kapAla before the manifestation of ghaTa and is the object of pratIti “ghaTo bhavishyati”. VedAnta ParibhAshA defines prAk-abhAva in the similar lines of NyAya. It also explains that Vivarana, Tattva PradIpikA use prAk-abhAva and that cannot be explained unless prAk-abhAva is accepted - स चाभावश्चतुर्विधः प्रागभावः प्रध्वंसाभावोऽत्यन्ताभावोऽन्योन्याभावश्चेति । तत्र मृत्पिण्डादौ कारणे कार्यस्य घटादेरुत्पत्तेः पूर्वं योऽभावः स प्रागभावः । स च भविष्यतीति प्रतीतिविषयः । ..अत एव विवरणेऽविद्यानुमाने प्रागभावव्यतिरिक्तत्वविशेषणम्, तत्त्वप्रदीपिकायामविद्यालक्षणे भावत्वविशेषणं च सङ्गच्छते । एवं चतुर्विधानामभावानां योग्यानुपलब्ध्या प्रतीतिः ।

However, as BAlabodhinI clarifies in page 1157, prAk-abhAva is not accepted in siddhAnta. And it is only following the NaiyAyikAs that such usage has been made in advaita texts. It is not the siddhAnta. नृसिंहाश्रमचरणा अद्वैतदीपिकाया द्वितीयपरिच्छेदे तथा विवरणटीकायां भावप्रकाशिकायाम्, चित्सुखाचार्याः प्रत्यक्तत्त्वप्रदीपिकायाम्, मधुसूदनसरस्वतीश्रीचरणाश्च अद्वैतरत्नरक्षणे प्रागभावस्यानपेक्षितत्वमाहुः कुत्राप्यनपेक्षितस्य प्रागभावस्यानङ्गीकारे न कापि हानिरित्यर्थः | कुत्रचित् अद्वैतिनां प्रागभावाभ्युपगमः पररीत्यैव इति बोध्यम् ॥

prAk-abhAva in Tattva anusandhAnam

The vishaya of pratIti “ghaTo bhavishyati” is not some prAk-abhAva but the sambandha of ghaTa with bhavishyat-kAla-sattA.

If one were to admit prAk-abhAva, then it would entail that ghaTa is ‘asat’ prior to its manifestation. And hence, ghaTa can never be produced.

Objection: Just as asat ghaTa cannot be produced, similarly, sat ghaTa cannot be produced either. If ghaTa is already there before its production, then what is the role of kAraNa-vyApAra such as potter, wheel, stick etc?

Answer: Sat ghaTa is present in the form of its cause namely clay. The expression of ghaTa does not take place without kAraNa-vyApAra. Thus, kAraNa-vyApAra is mere abhivyanjana of sat-ghaTa.

References

1. Advaita Siddhi
 - a. https://archive.org/details/BpcY_advaita-siddhi-with-bala-bodhini-sanskrit-commentary-vol.-1-by-dr.-yogendranath-
 - b. https://archive.org/details/xlhS_advaita-siddhi-sanskrit-with-commentary-bala-bodhini-by-yogendra-natha-sharma-ed/mode/2up
 - c. https://drive.google.com/file/d/18QZ8Fep7XP4YJe9tPLndI8kdmu53_EiI/view
2. Tattva-pradIpikA
 - a. <https://archive.org/details/chitsukhiyogindrananda/page/n483/mode/2up?view=theater>
3. VedAnta ParibhAshA
4. Tattva anusandhAnam
5. abhAva as a category: some philosophical problems
 - a. <https://ir.nbu.ac.in/server/api/core/bitstreams/36bc0da9-602b-4770-9934-8377c1606828/content>
6. https://advaitasharada.sringeri.net/display/prakarana/advaitasiddhi/devanagari#AS_C01